

POLICE/SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT		RULES AND REGULATIONS	
SUBJECT: Performance Evaluation		NUMBER: 1-6	
EFFECTIVE DATE: July 1, 1999		REVIEW DATE:	
AMENDS/SUPERSEDES: RR 1-6, October 1993		APPROVED: _____ Chief of Police/Sheriff	
CALEA STANDARDS: 35.1		VLEPSC STANDARDS: PER.06.01-06.04	

NOTE

This order is for internal use only, and does not enlarge an officer's civil or criminal liability in any way. It should not be construed as the creation of a higher standard of safety or care in an evidentiary sense, with respect to third-party claims. Violations of this directive, if proven, can only form the basis of a complaint by this department, and then only in a non-judicial administrative setting.

INDEX WORDS

Community-oriented policing; performance evaluation
Evaluation
Performance evaluation
Scale value application

I. POLICY

The department bears an obligation to the public and its own personnel to hire and maintain the best qualified officers. Further, the department's community-oriented policing philosophy demands that officers exhibit not only competent investigative skills but also succeed in communicating with many citizens in a variety of contexts. To that end, the department regularly and formally evaluates the performance of officers and other employees. The evaluation system discussed herein serves both the interests of management and employees. The purposes of the evaluation system are to (1) allow fair and impartial personnel decisions; (2) maintain and improve performance; (3) provide a basis and a medium for personnel counseling; (4) assist decisions about the tenure of probationary employees; and (5) identify training needs.

II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this order is to outline and describe the departmental evaluation process.

III. PROCEDURES

A. General

1. All officers shall be evaluated using the form located at the end of this order.

[Note: The performance evaluation program defined in this order derives from the field training officer (FTO) model. Many evaluation methods exist: the FTO model is provided as an example, not necessarily as a recommendation. The FTO evaluation system identifies key behaviors performed by law-enforcement officers, defines the minimum acceptable performance in each, and expects officers to demonstrate proficiency in all key behaviors. For more information about the FTO model, or to obtain copies of similar FTO evaluation programs, contact the Crime Prevention/Law Enforcement Services Section, DCJS. The FTO model is most appropriate for new officers and those with under five years of service. For veteran officers, some categories might be altered or dropped, with increasing emphasis placed on problem-solving, communications skills, or crime prevention. Similarly, it is not as important to rate supervisors on radio procedures, for instance, as it is to examine other behavior. Note that local county or municipal evaluations may govern officers instead of or supplementary to the FTO model.]

2. Evaluations reflect observations and perceptions by rating personnel and are, therefore, inherently subjective. Nevertheless, personnel shall be rated as having demonstrated unacceptable, acceptable, or superior behavior according to the criteria set forth in the appendix to this order.
3. At the discretion of the chief of police/sheriff, each officer shall be evaluated either every six months or annually. To constitute a satisfactory score, an officer must receive an **overall** 3.0 (or satisfactory). Officers who fail to receive an overall 3.0 shall be placed on probation for a period determined by the chief of police/sheriff. Within the probation period, an officer shall receive remedial training in deficient areas, demonstrate proficiency (or satisfactory improvement) in deficient areas, the training and improved behavior documented on the evaluation form. During a probationary period for remedial training, an officer shall receive evaluations weekly or bi-weekly, at the chief's/sheriff's discretion.
4. All evaluations shall be placed in employees' personnel files.
5. All newly-hired officers in their probationary year shall receive monthly written evaluations if no significant deficiencies are observed.
6. Officers promoted or transferred to new assignments shall receive evaluations at least every six months for the first year of assignment or promotion, or more often at the chief's/sheriff's discretion.

7. Officers shall be evaluated formally by the sergeant; the sergeant and the investigator by the chief of police/sheriff.
8. An officer who receives an unsatisfactory mark he or she perceives to be unjust may appeal same to the chief of police/sheriff. The officer concerned must rebut the comments or marks in writing and submit them through the chain of command to the chief of police/sheriff. In any case, final appeal extends to the town manager, in writing, through the chief of police *[not applicable to sheriffs]*.
9. At the beginning of each evaluation period, the officer shall list at least three objectives to be achieved during the next evaluation period. The objectives shall be included in the performance evaluation following consultation with the supervisor and an appropriate community leader.
10. The chief of police/sheriff shall designate a community leader to advise on performance evaluations. The community leader shall not rate the officer's behavior. The community leader shall help construct the officer's objectives for the coming year in consultation with the officer and the supervisor. The community leader may offer remarks on the evaluation form about the officer's success in achieving the objectives.
 - a. The evaluation objectives shall reflect community-policing concerns.

[Note: Allowing a non-law-enforcement professional to participate in evaluating an officer is controversial and may only work well when the citizen's participation is carefully defined and all concerned--the officer, the supervisor, the chief or sheriff, and the community leader--understand and agree to abide by the process. Here, the community leader only helps the officer and his supervisor determine objectives for the coming year and offers a comment on how the officer has met these objectives. The community leader does not otherwise participate in grading the officer. Some agencies have begun this procedure as a way to further community-oriented policing goals.]

[Note: Some agencies have expanded the scope of performance evaluations and have instituted fitness-for-duty evaluations. A fitness-for-duty (FDE) evaluation has been defined as a formal evaluation of the officer's emotional and behavioral adjustment as it relates to law-enforcement work. The International Association of Chiefs of Police Psychological Services Section has created model FDE guidelines. Note that FDE evaluations are performed by qualified psychologists or psychiatrists.]

B. Scale value application

1. The most difficult task facing the rater is applying the numerical scale which accompanies categories of behavior. Two raters might not apply the same

numerical values to the person under evaluation. To reduce differences between rating supervisors, the appendix to this instruction defines what constitutes unacceptable, acceptable, and superior behavior.

2. The philosophy of the evaluation form focuses on observations of demonstrated proficiency in behavior relevant to the job. Proficiency may be demonstrated in a variety of ways:
 - a. Performing the behavior in the field.
 - b. Performing the behavior in a practical exercise or simulation, accompanied by written or oral testing.
 - c. Written or oral testing (for subjects not suitable for field demonstration).
3. Any numerical rating below "3" shall be documented. Deficiencies in behavior shall be precisely documented. For example, an officer might receive a "1" (unacceptable) under category six, officer safety. In the comments section, the rater would write, "Officer consistently exposes his gun to traffic violators and approaches stopped vehicles with objects in both hands."
4. The categories of behavior represent key law-enforcement tasks. The categories are aligned in four subjects: critical performance tasks, knowledge, attitude/relations, and appearance.

C. Evaluation of sergeants, the investigator, and civilian employees

1. Civilian employees shall be evaluated on forms used by the town office for the purpose.
2. The investigator shall be evaluated using the same form as that for officers. Under "comments," the rater shall specifically refer to the accomplishments, training, and behavior of an investigator.
3. Sergeants shall be evaluated using the same form as that for officers. Under "comments" the chief of police/sheriff shall refer to an attached page containing, in a narrative, comments concerning the sergeant's supervisory performance. The chief shall address, at a minimum, the following points:
 - a. Ability to instill in officers a high regard and respect for community-oriented policing ideals, the rule of law, civil rights, and concern for victims.

- b. Ability to perceive performance weaknesses in his or her officers, conduct remedial training, and document improved proficiency.
- c. Command of patrol techniques, methods, and investigative procedures.
- d. Ability to reprimand, counsel, praise, or otherwise discipline his or her officers.
- e. Ability to take responsibility for the performance of his or her officers.

[Note: Agencies may wish to base their performance criteria on the 1997 DCJS document, Performance Outcomes, Training Objectives, Criteria and Lesson Plan Guides for Compulsory Minimum Training for Law Enforcement Officers. Also, agencies may wish to add a section to their order on performance evaluations that address their promotions, career advancement, or merit increases.]

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NAME _____

PERFORMANCE RATING INSTRUCTIONS:

RANK/ASSIGNMENT _____

The narrative portion of the evaluation follows the scale ratings. Refer to the rating guide for an explanation of the rated behaviors. Raters may comment on any observed behavior, but specific comments are required to justify ratings of "1," "2," or "5."

EVALUATION PERIOD _____

DATE OF EVALUATION _____

Unacceptable			Acceptable		Superior	
1	2	3	4	5	Not Observed	___

PERFORMANCE TASKS

(1) Driving skills (stress conditions)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(2) Driving Skills (non-stress conditions)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(3) Orientation skills	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(4) Field performance (stress conditions)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(5) Field performance (non-stress cond.)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(6) Officer safety (general)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(7) Officer safety (with suspicious persons and prisoners)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(8) Control of conflict (voice command)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(9) Control of conflict (physical skill)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(10) Investigative procedures	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(11) Report writing (organization/details)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ___
(12) Proper form selection (accuracy and details)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. _____

		Unacceptable		Acceptable		Superior		Not Observed	____
		1	2	3	4	5			
(13)	Report writing (grammar/spelling/ neatness)			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(14)	Report writing (appropriate time used)	1		2	3	4	5		N.O. ____
(15)	Radio (listens and comprehends transmissions)			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(16)	Radio (articulation of transmissions)			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____

COMMUNITY POLICING SKILLS

(17) Self-initiated activity			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(18) Problem-solving/decision-making			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(19) Community-policing objectives			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____

KNOWLEDGE

(20) Knowledge of department orders			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(21) Knowledge of criminal law			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(22) Knowledge of traffic law			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____

ATTITUDE/RELATIONS

(23) Acceptance of feedback			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(24) Relationship with citizens			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(25) Relationship with co-workers/super.			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
(26) General demeanor			1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____

Unacceptable			Acceptable		Superior		
1	2	3	4	5	Not Observed ____		

APPEARANCE

(27)	General appearance	1	2	3	4	5	N.O. ____
------	--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

Overall Average Score ____

PRINCIPAL STRENGTHS OBSERVED DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD:

PRINCIPAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD:

OFFICER'S OBJECTIVES FOR THE NEXT EVALUATION PERIOD:

1.

2.

3.

SUPERVISOR'S EVALUATION OF OFFICER'S PROGRESS TOWARDS OBJECTIVES:

COMMUNITY LEADER'S OBSERVATIONS ON PROGRESS TOWARDS OBJECTIVES:

Rating Authority _____ **Date** _____
(Print name and sign)

Officer's Signature _____ **Date** _____

Chief's/Sheriff's Signature _____ **Date** _____

Form Rev. 11/98

APPENDIX TO RR 1-6 RATING SCALE VALUES

(Rev. 11/98)

The task of evaluating and rating an officer's performance shall be based on the following numerical scale value definitions. These definitions serve as a means of standardizing the evaluation process.

(1) DRIVING SKILLS: STRESS CONDITIONS

1. Unacceptable: Involved in accident(s). Overuses red/blue lights and siren. Excessive and unnecessary speed. Fails to slow for intersections or loses control on corners.
3. Acceptable: Maintains control of vehicle. Evaluates driving situations and reacts properly. Proper speed for conditions.
5. Superior: High degree of reflex ability and competence in driving skills. Superior judgment shown in use of lights and siren. Controls speed skillfully.

(2) DRIVING SKILLS: NON-STRESS CONDITIONS

1. Unacceptable: Continually violates traffic law (red/blue lights, speed, stop signs, etc.). Involved in chargeable accidents. Lacks dexterity and coordination during vehicle operation.
3. Acceptable: Able to maintain control of vehicle while being alert to activity outside vehicle. Practices good defensive driving techniques.
5. Superior: Sets good examples of lawful, courteous driving while exhibiting good manipulative skill in operating the radio, using the street index, etc.

(3) ORIENTATION SKILL

1. Unacceptable: Becomes disoriented when responding to stressful situations. Unable to relate his/her location to their destination. Unable to use map under stress. Unable to determine compass directions during stressful situations.
3. Acceptable: Aware of his/her location. Able to use map effectively under stress. Demonstrates good sense of direction when responding to stressful situations.
5. Superior: Always responds quickly to stressful calls by the most appropriate route. Does not have to refer to map. Does not become disoriented during stressful situations. Calmly operates the radio and coordinates the responses of other officers.

(4) FIELD PERFORMANCE: STRESS CONDITIONS

1. Unacceptable: Becomes emotional and panic stricken. Unable to function; loses temper. Endangers safety of self and other officers and citizens by inattention to the demands of the job.
3. Acceptable: Exhibits a calm and controlled attitude. Can perform reasonably well at least in preventing a situation from deteriorating. Reasonably conscious of officer safety measures and protection of citizens from further harm.
5. Superior: Maintains control and brings order under virtually any circumstances without assistance. Remembers and carries out key police duties properly.

(5) FIELD PERFORMANCE: NON-STRESS CONDITIONS

1. Unacceptable: Confused and disoriented as to what action should be taken in a given situation. Numerous specific examples of bad judgment can be shown.
3. Acceptable: Able to assess situation and take proper action.
5. Superior: Requires no assistance and always takes proper action. Excellent field judgment.

(6) OFFICER SAFETY: GENERAL

1. Unacceptable: Frequently fails to exercise basic officer safety precautions. Examples:
 - a. Exposes weapons (baton, handgun, etc) to suspect.
 - b. Fails to keep gun hand free during enforcement situations.
 - c. Stands directly in front of violator's car door.
 - d. Fails to control suspect's movements.
 - e. Does not maintain sight of violator while writing summons.
 - f. Fails to use illumination when necessary.
 - g. Fails to advise radio when leaving vehicle.
 - h. Fails to maintain good physical condition.
 - i. Fails to use or maintain personal safety equipment properly.
 - j. Does not foresee potentially dangerous situations.
 - k. Points weapon at other officers.
 - l. Stands too close to vehicular traffic.
 - m. Stands in front of door when knocking.
 - n. Fails to have weapon ready when appropriate.
 - o. Fails to cover other officers.
 - p. Fails to search police vehicle before duty or after transporting prisoners.
 - q. Fails to check equipment.
 - r. Fails to properly search or handcuff prisoners.

3. Acceptable: Understands principles of officer safety and generally applies them.
5. Superior: Always maintains position of safety and advantage. Does not become unduly anxious or apprehensive, over-cautious or overconfident.

(7) OFFICER SAFETY: WITH SUSPICIOUS PERSONS AND PRISONERS

1. Unacceptable: Frequently violates officer safety standards. Fails to "pat search" or confronts suspicious persons while seated in patrol vehicle. Fails to handcuff prisoners. Fails to thoroughly search prisoners or vehicles. Fails to maintain a position of advantage with prisoners.
3. Acceptable: Generally displays awareness of potential danger from suspicious persons and prisoners. Maintains position of advantage.
5. Superior: Always maintains position of advantage and is alert to changing conditions.

(8) CONTROL OF CONFLICT: VOICE COMMAND

1. Unacceptable: Improper voice inflection, i.e., too soft, too loud, indecisive, confused commands, etc. Few problems resolved as result of officer's oral direction.
3. Acceptable: Speaks with authority in a calm, clear voice.
5. Superior: Always appears to be in complete command through voice tone and bearing.

(9) CONTROL OF CONFLICT: PHYSICAL SKILL

1. Unacceptable: Cowardly, physically unable to handle most situations, or uses too much or too little force for given situations.
3. Acceptable: Maintains control without excessive force. Maintains self in good physical condition.
5. Superior: Excellent knowledge of and ability to use restraining holds. Always ready to use necessary force. Maintains above average physical condition.

(10) INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURES

1. Unacceptable: Does not plan an investigative strategy. Cannot define investigative goals, i.e., successful prosecution, arrest, recovery of property, development of informants. Leaves out important steps in investigations. Fails to connect legal and

departmental guidelines while conducting investigation. Cannot coordinate aspects of the investigation, i.e., interviews, searches, notetaking, report-writing.

3. Acceptable: Maintains command of a crime scene. Able to assess the requirements of the situation concerning collection and preservation of evidence, interviews, and interrogations. Undertakes most of these functions with little or no direction.
5. Superior: Requires no supervision in organizing and undertaking an investigation. Identifies all possible sources of physical evidence. Identifies all potential witnesses and victims. Conducts complete interview. Uses time efficiently.

(11) REPORT WRITING: ORGANIZATION AND DETAILS

1. Unacceptable: Incapable of organizing events into written form. Leaves out many important details. Puts in inappropriate information. Much of the work will have to be redone.
3. Acceptable: Converts field events into a logical sequence of thought to include all elements of the situation. The narrative leaves the reader with a good understanding of what took place.
5. Superior: A complete and detailed account of what occurred from beginning to end. Written and organized so that any reader has a clear understanding of what occurred. Full consideration is given to the needs of investigator/prosecutor.

(12) PROPER FORM SELECTION: ACCURACY AND DETAILS

1. Unacceptable: Unable to determine proper forms for given situations. Forms filled out incorrectly or incompletely.
3. Acceptable: Knows most standard forms and understands format. Completes forms with reasonable accuracy.
5. Superior: Consistently and rapidly completes detailed forms with no assistance. High degree of accuracy.

(13) REPORT WRITING: GRAMMAR/SPELLING/NEATNESS

1. Unacceptable: Illegible, misspelled words, incomplete sentence structure.
3. Acceptable: Grammar, spelling, and neatness are satisfactory in that errors are rare and do not impair understanding.
5. Superior: Very neat and legible. No spelling mistakes and excellent grammar.

(14) REPORT WRITING: APPROPRIATE TIME USED

1. Unacceptable: Requires 2-3 hours to correctly complete a basic simple report.
3. Acceptable: Correctly completes simple basic reports in thirty minutes.
5. Superior: Correctly completes simple basic reports in no more time than that of a skilled veteran officer. (Depending on the type of report, the time will vary.)

(15) RADIO: LISTENS AND COMPREHENDS TRANSMISSIONS

1. Unacceptable: Repeatedly misses call sign and is unaware of radio traffic in adjoining beats. Frequently has to ask dispatcher to repeat transmissions or does not understand message.
3. Acceptable: Copies most radio transmissions directed at him/her. Generally aware of adjoining beat radio traffic.
5. Superior: Always comprehends radio transmissions and makes a written record. Always aware of and reacts to radio traffic in adjoining beats.

(16) RADIO: ARTICULATION OF TRANSMISSIONS

1. Unacceptable: Does not plan before transmitting message. Under or over modulation, resulting in dispatcher or other units constantly asking for a repeat.
3. Acceptable: Uses proper procedure with short, clear, concise transmissions.
5. Superior: Always uses proper procedure with clear, calm voice, even under stress conditions.

(17) SELF-INITIATED ACTIVITY

1. Unacceptable: Does not see or avoids activity. Does not follow up on situations; rationalizes suspicious circumstances. Gets involved inappropriately too often. Ignores departmentally defined problems.
3. Acceptable: Recognizes and identifies suspected criminal activity. Makes cases from routine activity. Makes recommendations for directed patrol. Promotes departmental crime-prevention programs. Networks with private and public associations or agencies.
5. Superior: Catalogs, maintains, and uses information given at briefings and from bulletins or crime reports for reasonable cause to stop persons or vehicles. Makes quality arrests. Shows balance in the type and extent of self-initiated activity. Combines directed patrol with community involvement through development of

mutual respect and trust. Consistently develops and shares intelligence with other team officers. Actively develops and nurtures Neighborhood Watch programs.

(18) PROBLEM SOLVING/DECISION-MAKING ABILITY

1. Unacceptable: Acts without thought or is indecisive. Relies on others to make decisions. Numerous examples of bad decisions or indecision can be shown.
3. Acceptable: Able to reason out problems and relate them to what he/she was taught. Has good perception and ability to make own decisions. Maintains minimal informal community contacts consistent with departmental community-oriented policing objectives.
5. Superior: Excellent perception in foreseeing problems and arriving at advanced decisions. Makes timely, quality decisions. Recommends or submits proposals concerning community partnerships to attack specific crime problems. Adept at mediating, negotiating, solving community problems informally. Acts as liaison to relevant non-profit agencies such as food banks and the Girl and Boy Scouts. Consistently alert to ways of improving the quality of life in the officer's assigned community.

(19) COMMUNITY-POLICING OBJECTIVES

1. Unacceptable: Maintains a minimal reactive policing profile in the community. Not proactive in developing informal community contacts or developing Neighborhood Watch alliances with citizens. Minimal promotion of crime-prevention techniques.
3. Acceptable: Organizes Neighborhood Watch alliances with citizens; distributes crime-prevention literature and promotes crime-prevention methods and philosophy when interacting with citizens; gives referrals to social-assistance agencies. Visits local businesses to enlist help in crime prevention.
5. Superior: Not only offers citizen referrals to social-assistance agencies, but actively seeks and executes opportunities to link social services agencies to citizens, obtain code enforcement, and coordinate drug treatment, improved sanitation or animal control, or noise abatement. Actively advises landlords, contractors, and others about CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design). Organizes and coordinates the work of volunteers.

(20) KNOWLEDGE OF DEPARTMENTAL ORDERS

1. Unacceptable: Has little knowledge of departmental orders. Makes no attempt to learn them. Frequent violations of orders.
3. Acceptable: Familiar with most commonly applied rules and procedures; is able to apply them to most field situations.

5. Superior: Exceptional working knowledge of rules, procedures, and orders.

(21) KNOWLEDGE OF CRIMINAL LAW

1. Unacceptable: Does not know the elements of basic offenses. Reports and performance continually show inability to apply criminal law to field situations.
3. Acceptable: Has a working knowledge of commonly used sections of code. Relates elements to observed criminal behavior.
5. Superior: Outstanding knowledge of criminal law. Able to apply laws to normal and unusual criminal activity.

(22) KNOWLEDGE OF TRAFFIC LAW

1. Unacceptable: Does not know the elements of basic offenses. Reports or actions continually show inability to apply traffic law to field situations.
3. Acceptable: Has a working knowledge of commonly used sections of code. Relates elements to observed traffic activity.
5. Superior: Outstanding knowledge of traffic law. Able to apply laws to normal and unusual traffic related activity.

(23) ACCEPTANCE OF FEEDBACK: VERBAL/BEHAVIOR

1. Unacceptable: Argumentative, rationalizes, refuses to admit mistakes, refuses to make corrections. Always considers feedback negative.
3. Acceptable: Accepts criticism in a positive manner and applies it to further learning. Accepts responsibility for his or her mistakes.
5. Superior: Solicits feedback and criticism in order to improve performance. Never argues with or blames others.

(24) RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITIZENS

1. Unacceptable: Abrupt, belligerent, overbearing, officious, introverted, or uncommunicative.
3. Acceptable: Courteous, friendly, and empathetic. Communicates in a professional and unbiased manner.
5. Superior: Establishes rapport and is always fair.

(25) RELATIONSHIPS WITH SUPERVISORS, CO-WORKERS

1. Unacceptable: Constantly argues with other officers or other superior officers. Belittles other officers or supervisors in front of other people. Fails to adhere to chain of command. Insubordinate.
3. Acceptable: Able to establish a good relationship with other officers and supervisors. Understands and adheres to chain of command. Respects other officers.
5. Superior: Establishes excellent relationships with other officers and supervisors. Possesses thorough understanding of chain of command, and adheres to it. Utmost respect shown to superior officers and peers as well.

(26) GENERAL DEMEANOR

1. Unacceptable: Officer cannot be depended upon to produce routine work without close supervision. Does not adapt readily to new situations, work hours, changing assignments. Tardy, complains about assignments, days off, duties.
3. Acceptable: Officer generally displays initiative, interest in the job, willingness to take on new challenges or schedule changes. Dependable.
5. Superior: Attentive beyond requirements of job. Constantly analyzes own work performance and devises and tries new approaches to problems. Consistently outstanding overall performance. High interest in welfare and image of department. Exemplary.

(27) GENERAL APPEARANCE

1. Unacceptable: Overweight, dirty shoes, uniforms, and leather. Long messy hair. Offensive body odor.
3. Acceptable: Neat, clean, and well-pressed uniform. Cleaned and shined shoes and leather. Well groomed hair.
5. Superior: Tailored uniforms, spit-shined shoes and leather. Command bearing.